

Appl. No. 09/728,619
Amdt. Dated November 8, 2004
Reply to Office Action of August 11, 2004

Docket No. CM04765H
Customer No. 22917

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 and 12 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of USPN 6,564,066 (Biggs, et al.) in view of USPN 5,583,869 (Grube, et al.).

Applicants appreciate the time that the Examiner spent during a November 8th telephone conference to discuss the claimed invention. Claims 1-21 remain in the application and reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in light of the amendments to Claims 1 and 12 and the following remarks.

As discussed during the telephone conference, Applicants' claimed invention is not taught or suggested by Biggs and Grube. To make clear Applicants' claimed invention, Applicants' have amended the claims. Namely, Applicants' claimed invention has been amended to clarify that

- a "talkgroup call is between communication units of [a] RF communication system"
- a "console is coupled to a router" and
- "identifying a number of priority console sites for the talkgroup call is based on whether the talkgroup call is a priority."

Support for each of the amendments is found in the Specification in a number of places, including page 6, lines 1-19 and in FIG. 1.

Appl. No. 09/728,619
Amdt. Dated November 9, 2004
Reply to Office Action of August 11, 2004

Docket No. CM04795H
Customer No. 22817

Accordingly, this application is believed to be in proper form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any fees associated herewith, including extension of time fees, to
Deposit Account 502117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department
1303 E. Algonquin Road
Law Department
Schaumburg, IL 60196
Customer Number: 22917

By: *Indira Saladi*
Indira Saladi
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,759

Telephone: 847.576.6735
Fax No.: 847.576.0721